

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants amended claim 14 to correct a redundant instance of “the” and amended claims 8, 9, and 10 to change “application” to “applicable” to correct a clear grammatical mistake. Applicants request the Examiner to enter these amendments because they correct minor errors and do not alter the scope of the claims.

1. Claims 1-6, 15-20, and 29-34 are Patentable Over the Cited Art

The Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 15-20, and 29-34 as obvious (35 U.S.C. §103) over Robinson (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0080402) in view of Hansen (U.S. Patent No. 6,509,974). Applicants traverse with respect to the amended claims.

Independent claims 1, 15, and 29 recite creating a first job ticket describing print instructions applicable to a print source file and creating at least one additional job ticket describing different print instructions applicable to the print source file. At least one page is altered in the print source file and the job tickets applicable to the print source file are updated in response to altering at least one page in the print source file. Each job ticket is stored.

The Examiner cited step 214 in para. [0073] and step 222 in para. [0076] of Robinson as teaching the claim requirements of updating the job tickets applicable to the print source file in response to altering at least one page in the print source file. (Final Office Action, pg. 3) Applicants traverse.

The cited para. [0073] mentions that tickets for one job are linked to the master ticket and the user may activate the current ticket set. If activation is desired, in step 214 the master ticket template is marked. The cited para. [0076] mentions that as soon as the job tickets sets have been provided, the master ticket is linked with a set of image data.

Nowhere do the cited paras. [0073] and [0076] of Robinson anywhere teach or suggest updating the job tickets applicable to the print source file in response to altering at least one page in the print source file. Instead, the cited Robinson discusses how a master ticket is updated or marked, but not the individual job tickets that are linked to the master ticket. In this respect, the cited Robinson teaches away from the claim requirement of updating the job tickets applicable to the print source file because the cited Robinson discusses updating a master ticket, and not the individual job tickets as claimed.

The Examiner found that Robinson does not teach altering a page in the print source file. (Final Office Action, pg. 3) In view of this deficiency, the cited Robinson would likewise not teach updating job tickets in response to altering at least one page in the print source file.

The Examiner cited col. 6, lines 52-55 of Hansen as teaching the additional requirement of altering a page in a print source file. (Final Office Action, pg. 3) Applicants traverse this finding.

The cited col. 6 of Hansen mentions that formatting and other modifications to a document can be globally applied to the entire document or to select pages, such as a shifted margin. Although the cited Hansen mentions how modifications can be applied to an entire document, there is no teaching or suggestion of the claim requirement of updating job tickets applicable to the print source file in response to altering at least one page in the print source file. Instead, the cited Hansen mentions how modifications can be applied to all or some of the pages of the document, not job tickets as claimed.

Applicants submit that even if one were to combine Robinson and Hansen, this combination still does not teach or suggest the claim requirement of updating the job tickets applicable to the print source file in response to altering at least one page in the print source file. Modifying Robinson's master job ticket pointing to individual job tickets with Hansen's discussion of globally applying modifications to all pages in a document produces a combination where there are multiple job tickets linked by a master ticket and, separately, changes to one page in a document can be applied to all pages. These references alone or in combination do not teach or suggest updating the job tickets applicable to the print source file in response to altering at least one page in the print source file.

Accordingly, claims 1, 15, and 29 are patentable over the cited art because the cited combination of Robinson and Hansen fail to teach or suggest all the claim requirements, either alone or in combination.

Claims 2-6, 16-20, and 30-34 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from one of claims 1, 15, and 29, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above.

With respect to the obviousness (35 U.S.C. §103) rejection of claims 4, 5, 18, 19, 32, and 33, further discussed below, which concern specific types of alterations to the print source file

and specific updating, the Examiner cited col. 6, lines 45-49 of Hansen as teaching the claimed modification operations. (Final Office Action, pg. 3)

The cited col. 6 of Hansen discusses how pages in a document may be modified. Although the cited Hansen discusses how a print job may be modified, nowhere is there any teaching or suggestion in the cited Hansen of the added claim requirement of updating the job tickets applicable to the print source file in response to altering at least one page in the print source file.

The Examiner further cited Robinson as teaching updating the job tickets. As discussed, the above discussed Robinson teaches modifications to a master ticket pointing to the individual tickets, but nowhere suggests updating multiple job tickets in response to altering the print source file describing print instructions applicable to the print source file.

If one were to modify the cited Robinson with Hansen, the combined teachings concern allowing the creation of multiple print job tickets for a document (as in Robinson) and then allowing altering of a document (as in Hansen). Nowhere is there any teaching or suggestion in either the cited Robinson or Hansen of the combination of requirements of updating multiple job tickets created for a print job source file if the print source file is altered.

Accordingly, claims 4, 5, 18, 19, 32, and 33 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

2. Claims 7-14, 21-28, and 35-42 are Patentable Over the Cited Art

The Examiner rejected claims 7-14, 21-28, and 35-42 as obvious (35 U.S.C. §103(a)) over Robinson in view of Hansen and further in view of Suzuki (U.S. Patent No. 5,923,013). Applicants traverse.

Claims 7-14, 21-28, and 35-42 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from one of claims 1, 15, and 29, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above. Moreover, the below discussed dependent claims provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Claims 7, 8, 21, 22, 35, and 36 depend from one of claims 1, 2, 15, 16, 29, and 30 and further require that the print source file comprises a first print source file. Altering, the at least one page in the first print source file comprises importing at least one page from a second print source file into the first print source file. The claims further require receiving selection to retain

the print characteristics of the at least one imported page as defined in a job ticket associated with the second print source file and that updating the job tickets applicable to the first print source comprises automatically amending the print instructions of the first job ticket and of the at least one additional job ticket applicable to the first print source file to account for the at least one imported page.

The Examiner cited col. 15, lines 7-13 and col. 23, lines 32-44 of Suzuki as teaching the additional requirements of altering the print source file by importing at least one page from a second print source file into the first print source file and choosing to retain the print characteristics of the imported page. (Final Office Action, pg. 5) Applicants traverse.

The cited col. 15 of Suzuki discusses a variable page print mode using variable contents. The cited col. 23 discusses how pages have page data of the page sizes and paper orientations. Nowhere do any of the cited references teach or suggest updating the job tickets applicable to the print source file by automatically amending the print instructions of the first job ticket and of the at least one additional job ticket applicable to the first print source file to account for the at least one imported page. Nowhere does the cited Robinson, Hansen nor Suzuki teach or suggest the claim requirements of updating multiple print job tickets applicable to a print source file in response to importing a page into the print source file.

Accordingly, claims 7, 8, 21, 22, 35, and 36 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Claims 9, 10, 23, 24, 37, and 38 include the requirements of claims 7, 8, 21, 22, 35, and 36, respectively, and provide further requirements of assigning default set of print characteristics to the imported page defined in an active job ticket associated with the first print source file. , Applicants submit that these claims are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed with respect to claims 7, 8, 21, 22, 35, and 36 and because their additional requirements in combination with the base and intervening claims provide further grounds of distinction over the cited art.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicants submit that the pending claims 1-42 are patentable over the art of record. Applicants submit that no additional fees are needed. Nonetheless, should any additional fees be required, please charge Deposit Account No. 09-0466.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact him at (310) 553-7977 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: May 15, 2006

By: /David Victor/

David W. Victor
Registration No. 39,867

Please direct all correspondences to:

David Victor
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Tel: 310-553-7977
Fax: 310-556-7984